DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 245 610 HE 017 335

AUTHOR Decker, Robert; And Others
TITLE Faculty Decision-Making Impact and Collective Bargaining in Illinois Community Colleges. ASHE 1984 Annual Meeting Paper.
PUB DATE Mar 84
NOTE 42p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education (Chicago, IL, March 12-14, 1984).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Collective Bargaining; *College Faculty; *Community Colleges; Decision Making; *Faculty College Relationship; Higher Education; *Participative Decision Making; State Colleges; Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Participation
IDENTIFIERS *ASHE Annual Meeting; *Illinois

ABSTRACT

The impact of collective bargaining in selected areas of institutional decision making at Illinois community colleges was studied. The study institutions were public community colleges that had comprehensive academic programs and were campus-based. Questionnaire responses were received from 645 teaching faculty. Findings include the following: the areas in which faculty had the greatest impact on decision making dealt with the curriculum, degree requirements, grading system, and program admission requirements; while the areas where faculty perceived the least impact on institutional decision making included negotiating individual faculty salaries, dismissing faculty with cause, and selecting the top campus administrators. Comparisons were made of faculty views at unionized and nonunionized campuses, along with demographic and background characteristics of faculty at unionized/nonunionized institutions. It was found that in 19 of 20 areas, faculty at unionized colleges viewed that they had greater impact in institutional decision making than did faculty working at nonunionized colleges. In addition, faculty in unionized and in nonunionized colleges demonstrated similar demographic and background characteristics. Appendices include a bibliography and study data. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED245610

FACULTY DECISION-MAKING IMPACT AND COLLECTIVE BARGAINING IN ILLINOIS COMMUNITY COLLEGES

by

Robert Decker, Edward Hines, and John Brickell
Center for Higher Education, College of Education
Illinois State University

HE017335

Presented at the Annual Meeting, Association for the Study of Higher Education, Chicago, March, 1984

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Edward R. Hines

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

- This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- ☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ASHE Association for the Study of Higher Education
The George Washington University/One Dupont Circle, Suite 630/Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 296-2597

This paper was presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education held at the Conrad Hilton Hotel in Chicago, Illinois, March 12-14, 1984. This paper was reviewed by ASHE and was judged to be of high quality and of interest to others concerned with the research of higher education. It has therefore been selected to be included in the ERIC collection of ASHE conference papers.

Traditionally, colleges have exhibited a form of "participatory democracy" in which both faculty and administration are involved, although it is recognized that final decisions for college policies are made by the boards of trustees or governing boards. However, a change seems to be taking place on the community college campus. Faculties have been seeking greater involvement in institutional governance. It has been reported in the literature that one of the reasons for faculty favoring collective bargaining is to increase their impact in institutional decision-making (Kemerer and Baldridge, 1975).

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine the impact of collective bargaining in selected areas of institutional decision-making at Illinois community colleges. A representative sample of teaching faculty from Illinois public community colleges was selected to participate in the study.

In order to achieve this objective, we first looked at faculty impact on decision-making at public Illinois community colleges. A review was made of the major findings of a dissertation entitled, "Faculty Impact in Selected Areas of Institutional Decision-Making in Illinois Community Colleges" (Decker, 1983). Following a review of these dissertation data, additional analysis of data was accomplished as a means of examining similarities and differences between faculty impact in institutional decision-making at unionized and non-unionized colleges within this sample.[1]

---

[1] A unionized college was defined as an Illinois community college which had a collectively negotiated employment contract for the 1982-1983 academic year.

Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework underlying this study relied upon the shared-authority basis of faculty involvement in campus governance and decision-making (Kemerer and Baldridge, 1975). While it is recognized that shared-authority forms the basis of campus governance, there have been a number of forces mitigating against shared-authority as an operational foundation for governance and decision-making. First, community college faculty, more than faculty in other types of institutions, have not traditionally been "full partners" in campus governance, as the term, shared authority, would suggest (Richardson, 1979). Community colleges have been characterized by models of strong if not dominant administrative authority. It is only in more recent years that community college faculty have expressed dissatisfaction with their lack of impact upon institutional governance.

A second force has been a lack of faculty involvement in institutional decision-making. This lack of faculty involvement has been identified as one of several major factors in the unionization movement of faculty (Tice, 1973). Whether or not faculty unions have made substantive differences in the decision-making involvement of faculty remains a major unresolved issue in the literature. Third, the interest of faculty desiring more meaningful involvement in institutional decision-making has increased in recent times (Magarrell, 1982). Retrenchment and reallocation budgets now being encountered by colleges and universities may have added to faculty desires for a greater role in institutional decision-making. Finally, there is a continuing need for empirical research in order to generate useful data for institutional officials, including administrators

and faculty leaders, to use in revising existing policies and formulating new opportunities for campus governance and institutional decision making.

Methodology

Sample

The invited sample of this study included 920 teaching faculty in Illinois public community college districts. Twenty teaching faculty in each Illinois public community college campus were identified randomly from current college catalogs and from information obtained at the office of the Illinois Community College Board. Of the fifty-two Illinois community college campuses, five were eliminated due to idiosyncratic organizational structures, and one college chose not to participate in the study. A total of forty-six individual campuses were involved in the study.

The study was limited to public community colleges in Illinois which had comprehensive academic programs and were campus based. The researchers recognized the limitations of cross-sectional surveys.

Instrumentation

The instrument used in this study was based on an instrument designed in 1970 by Subcommittee of Committee T on College and University Governance of the American Association of University Professors and used by the Academic Collective Bargaining Information Service. Respondents were asked to identify the actual and preferred extent of faculty impact on their campus. An open-ended question was included which asked individuals to identify the areas where faculty impact increased or decreased as the result of collective bargaining.

Twenty items pertaining to specific areas of institutional decision-making were formulated. The general categories of the questionnaire dealt with faculty personnel status, academic operations, administrator selection,

financial planning and policy, and professional duties. The instrument was field tested at Illinois State University utilizing administrators, faculty members, and graduate students who had experience in Illinois public community colleges. Additionally, a panel of community college professionals reviewed the instrument for validity.

A detailed cover letter emphasizing the voluntary participation and confidentiality of this project was mailed along with a twenty-seven item survey instrument to twenty randomly selected teaching faculty at each of the forty-six campuses. Follow-up requests were mailed at three-week intervals, and two follow-up requests were used. At the end of nine weeks, responses were received from 621 individuals (67.5%), forming the basis for the analysis. An additional 24 responses were received for a total of 645 or 70.1% of the sample.

Data Analysis

The dissertation data utilized an examination and comparison of demographic variables and categories of faculty perceptions about actual and preferred impact of faculty in institutional decision-making. Statistics used to summarize and analyze the results included frequency distributions, crosstabulations, and the t-test. Computational procedures were accomplished by utilizing specific subprograms of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS).

Findings

As mentioned earlier, a brief summary of some of the major findings of the dissertation will be made, followed by presentation of the results of the additional analysis of the dissertation data.

Dissertation Findings

A summary of responses in rank order showing actual and preferred faculty impact in twenty areas of institutional decision making is depicted in Table 1. Along with this summary, Tables 2 and 3 identify frequencies and percentages of respondents from unionized institutions who indicated areas of increased and decreased impact as a result of collective bargaining.

Table 1 indicates that the category of academic operations which dealt with curriculum, degree requirements, grading system, and program admission requirements involved the highest degree of faculty impact in decision making. On the other hand, the areas where faculty perceived the least degree of impact on institutional decision making included negotiating individual faculty salaries with departments, dismissing faculty for cause, and selecting the top campus administrators including the president and the academic dean.

INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE

Tables 2 and 3 identify faculty views at unionized campuses about areas where there was either an increase in impact or a decrease in impact as a result of collective bargaining. As Table 2 indicates, these faculty respondents believed that collective bargaining had made a favorable impact on faculty raises in salary, establishing campus-wide faculty salary schedules, determining faculty teaching loads and teaching assignments.

INSERT TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE

Table 3 identifies areas where collective bargaining was perceived to have had a negative impact on faculty decision making on campus. Clearly, the selection of campus-wide top administrators, and even the selection of department and division chairs, were viewed as areas where collective bargaining had made least impact. Establishing faculty salary levels for individuals along with faculty authority in campus governance were also identified as areas where collective bargaining had made the least impact on campus.

INSERT TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE

Additional Analysis of Data

The dissertation data were subjected to additional data analysis, and the results form the basis for the major findings reported in this paper. The purpose of this effort was to determine similarities and differences between unionized and non-unionized campuses, thus enabling observations to be made about the evident impact of collective bargaining on the campuses represented in this statewide population.

In order to accomplish this purpose, the data were analyzed using the t-test of differences between mean scores, the characteristics of respondents at unionized and non-unionized campuses were compared, and respondent groups were examined at both unionized and non-unionized campuses in order to determine if there were relationships between demographic characteristics and the extent of faculty impact on areas of institutional decision making.

Between-group Similarities and Differences. In order to determine the extent to which unionized and non-unionized campuses might be similar in faculty impact on decision making, a t-test for differences between mean

scores was calculated. The measurement scale utilized in the survey questionnaire was scored on the basis of "1" indicating great impact, "2" indicating moderate impact, "3" indicating little impact, and "4" indicating no faculty impact in that area of institutional decision making. The scale was assumed to consist of equal-appearing intervals.

The results of this analysis are shown in Table 4. Mean scores, standard deviations, and t values are shown for each of the twenty decision-making areas. There were statistically significant t values in 10 of the 20 decision-making areas. In all but the one area pertaining to selecting department and division chairs, the mean scores were numerically lower for unionized campuses, indicating that faculty on unionized campuses perceived that they had a greater degree of impact in institutional decision making than did faculty at non-unionized campuses.

INSERT TABLE 4 ABOUT HERE

Demographic Characteristics. It was necessary to identify and examine the similarities between these two groups of faculty at unionized and non-unionized institutions. Should these two groups emerge as substantially different in demographic characteristics, these differences might account for some or all of the between-group differences in decision-making impact.

Table 5 displays the frequencies and percentages for the two basic groups for each category within the six demographic variables of age, sex, tenure status, highest degree earned, the number of years teaching at the college, and the respondent's primary discipline. A clear observation to be made about Table 5 is the similarity between these two groups. One

would conclude that these two faculty groups do not differ substantially on any variable and on any category within the variables.

In the area of age, the non-unionized group is slightly older and more evenly spread across the three categories from 30 to 59. A larger proportion of the unionized group is in the 40-49 age group. There are slightly more women in the unionized group than the non-unionized group. There is a slightly larger percentage of non-tenured faculty in the non-unionized group. In the unionized group, relatively more faculty have progressed in educational attainment beyond the master's degree than in the non-unionized group. In years teaching at the college, the unionized group is concentrated a bit more in the 11-15 category than in non-unionized group. There is a similarity between the two groups in primary discipline.

INSERT TABLE 5 ABOUT HERE

Within-group Similarities and Differences. The area of within-group similarities and differences enabled us to examine the distribution of respondents for the response categories of great, moderate, little, or no impact within each of the demographic variables. For this purpose, cross-tabulations were utilized with chi squares and significance levels resported for each table. For the sake of some degree of efficiency, the areas where significant chi squares occurred are reported in Table 6 in summary form. The variable of highest degree attained is omitted due to the evidently random occurrence of three significant chi squares involving that variable.

INSERT TABLE 6 ABOUT HERE

For the age variable, no significant chi squares emerged for either unionized or for non-unionized institutions. For the remaining four variables, a total of 17 significant chi-squares were identified, seven of which occurred in unionized institutions and the remaining 10 occurred in non-unionized colleges. The significant chi-squares will be discussed for the unionized colleges, and then for the non-unionized colleges.

In the unionized colleges, there were two significant chi squares each for sex, tenure, and primary discipline, and there was one significant chi square for years teaching. Table 7 deals with four selected areas of decision making, and identifies four significant chi squares. Relatively more males than females believed that they had greater impact on selecting department and division chairs. Also, relatively more males than females said they had greater impact in short-range budgetary planning. Table 7 pertains to the tenure variable, also. Proportionately more non-tenured faculty said that they had greater impact in giving input to appointing new staff, while proportionately more tenured professors believed that they had greater impact in determining teaching loads for faculty.

INSERT TABLE 7 ABOUT HERE

Table 8 deals with the variable of years teaching at the college. Consistent with the literature, it is observed that as seniority increases respondents tend to believe that they have greater impact in institutional decision making. Conversely, those with less seniority according to years teaching at the college tend to express views about not having as much impact on decision making. Of course, these observations only apply to the single decision-making area of selecting the chief executive officer.

INSERT TABLE 8 ABOUT HERE

Tables 9 and 10 pertain to the variable of primary discipline. In appointing new faculty, a number of disciplines were represented as generally having greater decision-making impact, and these included communications, business, math, social science, and fine arts. Nursing and physical education faculty expressed that they had relatively less impact in this decision area. In the variable of establishing new programs, faculty who believed that they had relatively greater impact included business and nursing, and those who believed that they had less impact included communications, humanities, and fine arts.

INSERT TABLES 9 & 10 ABOUT HERE

There were 10 significant chi squares in the non-unionized college group. There were two significant chi squares involving the variable of sex, three for the tenure variable, one for years teaching, and four for primary discipline. Relatively more males expressed greater impact in the area of determining types of degrees awarded, and relatively more females expressed greater impact in the determination of individual faculty salaries, as indicated in Table 11. There was consistency in the variable involving tenure. In all three decision areas, tenured faculty said that they had relatively greater impact than did non-tenured faculty.

INSERT TABLE 11 ABOUT HERE

Table 12 pertains to the variable of evaluating and revising the curriculum, and there are five different age ranges represented. A generally curvilinear relationship appeared with the younger (teaching 10 years or less) and the more senior (teaching 21 years or more) expressing the opinion that they had relatively greater decision-making impact. Those who had been teaching from 11 to 15 years believed that they had relatively less impact in this one decision-making area.

INSERT TABLE 12 ABOUT HERE

Tables 13 through 16 deal with the variable of primary discipline. Communications, nursing/allied health, and fine arts faculty expressed the view that they had relatively greater impact in decision making pertaining to all four of these areas. On the other hand, faculty in the areas of physical education, social science, humanities, and developmental education said that they had proportionately less impact in institutional decision making as represented by these four decision areas.

INSERT TABLES 13, 14, 15, & 16 ABOUT HERE

Summary and Discussion of Findings

In this section, the findings of the additional analysis of these data will be summarized briefly. First, the unionized and the non-unionized colleges exhibited substantial differences. There were significant t-values in ten of the 20 decision-making areas, and in 19 of the 20 areas faculty at unionized colleges viewed that they had a proportionately greater impact in institutional decision making than did faculty working at non-unionized

colleges. The survey with which these data were obtained was cross-sectional in design, thus subject to the limitations in this type of research. These data do not permit us to make causal inferences about whether or not unionization directly led to perceptions about greater impact in institutional decision making. It may be that in this particular group of colleges, there were already-existing perceptions about greater faculty decision-making impact, although this possibility is lessened by the similarity in demographics described below.

The second major finding was that faculty in unionized and in non-unionized colleges demonstrated similar demographic and background characteristics. These were similar groups of individuals in age, sex, tenure, highest degree attained, years teaching at the college, and primary discipline. Again, in a cross-sectional survey the view represents one point in time. It may be that these two faculty groups were different in demographic characteristics at another point in time. Yet, this is not likely because of a general lack of mobility among college faculty. Thus, it seems reasonable to posit that these two groups have not changed appreciably over time, and they remain similar in demographic characteristics. It is not demographic differences which might be resulting in different views about faculty impact in institutional decision making.

Third, faculty in unionized colleges did not confine their views about decision-making impact to any single area or small number of areas. The 10 areas where statistically significant differences were found represented faculty welfare concerns, the curriculum, presidential selection, campus budgetary planning, and the degree of faculty authority in campus governance. Whether or not these views are accurate representations of actual

involvement and impact, or whether they may be reflective of perceptions and thus be symbolic or idealized, the fact remains that faculty in unionized colleges perceive a greater impact across a range of decision-making areas than do faculty in non-unionized colleges.

Fourth, it would appear that demographic differences within the non-unionized group are more important than in the unionized group when viewing faculty impact in institutional decision making. In the unionized group, there were less within-group differences involving demographic characteristics. This finding is consistent with the literature which observes that unionization and collective bargaining mitigate individual differences in favor of the benefit which collective negotiations brings to the entire group. This finding is supported only by the fact that there were seven significant chi squares in the unionized group and 10 in the non-unionized group. This is not a great difference. Further, some of the chi square findings do not support this observation, such as males in the unionized college who perceive greater impact than females in both decision-making areas identified as having statistical significance. Further research will be undertaken to clarify this inconsistency. Some of the results involving non-unionized colleges do support this finding. One would expect that being able to negotiate individual faculty salaries would be more evident in non-unionized, than in unionized colleges, and this research supported that observation. In all three instances where significant chi squares were found involving tenure status, it was the tenured faculty who believed that they had more decision-making impact than did the non-tenured faculty.

The fifth finding pertains to years of teaching at the college. There was one significant chi square in each faculty group. Both would seem to

indicate that there may be evidence of a curvilinear relationship between years teaching and decision-making impact. That is, faculty with only a few years experience and those with over 20 years experience generally express greater decision-making impact. Those faculty in the middle ranges including 11-15 years of teaching experience express views about having less decision-making impact. In the unionized group, this observation was rather weak. However, it may suggest that comparatively young and then more senior faculty, perhaps for different reasons, experience more interest, involvement, and thus impact in institutional affairs while some of their mid-life counterparts go through a period characterized by a degree of disappointment or disillusionment about their influence over college matters.

Sixth, among the demographic variables it seemed that both primary discipline and tenure status were associated with views about faculty impact in institutional decision making, more than emerged involving the other demographic variables. Whether or not one has tenure and one's primary disciplinary affiliation, thus, may be important determinants in attitudes and opinions.

Seventh and last, faculty in both the nursing and communications fields expressed consistently greater decision-making impact. Faculty in humanities and in physical education/recreation tended to believe that they had less decision-making impact, regardless of whether or not the campus was unionized. It may be that nursing and communications faculty have greater interest in and perhaps control over the decision making occuring in their fields, at least as represented by the areas identified in this research.

In conclusion, additional research will be undertaken to carry this analysis a bit further in order to improve the clarity and strength of these observations. We will attempt to discover the interactive effects of demographic characteristics with union versus non-union affiliation. This will enable us to make more definitive statements about the extent to which demographic characteristics are related to unionization.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Academic Collective Bargaining Information Service. Scope of Public Bargaining in 14 Selected States. Washington, D.C.: Academic Collective Bargaining Information Service, 1977.

Adler, Daniel L. Governance and Collective Bargaining in Four-Year Institutions. Washington, D.C.: Academic Collective Bargaining Information Service, 1977. ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 168320, 1977.

Alvarado, Anthony J. "Academic Collective Bargaining and the Governance of the Public Two-Year College." Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 1978.

American Association for Higher Education. Faculty Participation in Academic Governance. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1967.

American Association of University Professors. "Statement on Collective Bargaining." A.A.U.P. Bulletin 58 (1972): 423-424.

Angell, George W. Faculty and Teacher Bargaining. Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath and Co., 1981.

_____. Handbook of Faculty Bargaining. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1977.

Angell, George W. "Two-Year College Experience." In E.D. Duryea, R.S. Fish and Associates. Faculty Unions and Collective Bargaining. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1973.

Baldridge, J. Victor. Power and Conflict in the University. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1971.

Baldridge, J. Victor and Kemerer, Frank R. "Academic Senates and Faculty Collective Bargaining." Journal of Higher Education 47 (1976): 391-411.

Baldridge, J. Victor, Kemerer, Frank R., and Associates. Assessing the Impact of Faculty Collective Bargaining. University Park, PA: Center for the Study of Higher Education, 1972.

Baldridge, J. Victor and Riley, Gary L. Governing Academic Organizations. Berkeley, CA: McCutchon Publishing Corp., 1977.

Baratz, Morton S. "Shared Authority and Collective Bargaining." Educational Record 58 (1978): 193-203.

Begin, James P. "Faculty Governance and Collective Bargaining." Journal of Higher Education 45 (1974): 582-593.

Birnbaum, Robert. "University Governance, Academic Bargaining and Catastrophe Theory." The Review of Higher Education 4 (1982): 1-21.

Blocker, Clyde D., Plummer, Robert H. and Richardson, Richard C. Two Year College: A Social Synthesis. Englewood Cliffs, N J: Prentice-Hall, 1975.

Blumer, Dennis H. "Faculty Collective Bargaining: A Status Report." Community and Junior College Journal 45 (1975): 27-29.

Bylsma, Donald and Blackburn, Robert T. Changes in Faculty Governance and Faculty Welfare: Some Empirical Consequences of Collective Negotiations. ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 058882, 1971.

Cameron, Kim. "The Relationship Between Faculty Unionism and Organizational Effectiveness." Academy of Management Journal 25 (1982): 6-24.

Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. Governance of Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973.

Carr, Robert and Von Eyck, Daniel. Collective Bargaining Comes to the Campus. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Higher Education, 1973.

Clarke, Carlene A. "The Yeshiva Case." The Journal of Higher Education 52 (September/October 1981): 449-469.

Collingwood, Dean W. The Current Status of Faculty Unionism in Higher Education: A Statistical Analysis. ERIC Document Reproduction Service. ED 134 079, July 1976.

Cross, K. Patricia. "Community Colleges on the Plateau." The Journal of Higher Education 52 (March/April 1981): 113-123.

Danese, Gino. "Perceptions of Bureaucracy and Faculty Satisfaction with Participation in Decision Making at Unionized and Nonunionized Institutions of Higher Education." Ed. D. dissertation, State University of New York at Albany, 1977.

Decker, Robert H. "Faculty Impact in Selected Areas of Institutional Decision Making in Illinois Community Colleges." Ed.D. Dissertation, Normal, Illinois, Illinois State University, 1983.

DePaoli, John A. "A Comparison of Working Conditions Between Community College Instructors in Collective Bargaining Contract Colleges and Traditional Colleges." Ph.D. dissertation, United States International University, 1974.

Education Commission of the States (Denver, CO). Faculty Collective Bargaining in Post-secondary Institutions: The Impact on the Campus and on the State. ERIC Document Reproduction Service. ED 062 968, May 1972.

Ernst, Richard J., ed. Adjusting to Collective Bargaining. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1975.

Ernst, Richard J. "Taking a Good Look." New Directions for Community Colleges 3 (1975): 91-98.

Faculty Bargaining Agents on 681 Campuses." The Chronicle of Higher Education (July 7, 1980): 7-8.

Falcone, Michael. Collective Bargaining: Its Effects on Campus Governance. Washington, D.C.: Academic Collective Bargaining Information Service, 1975.

Finkin, Matthew W. "Collective Bargaining and University Governance." Bulletin of the A.A.U.P. 57 (1971): 149-162.

Finkin, Matthew S., Gladstein, Robert A. and Osborne, Woodley B. A Primer on Collective Bargaining for College and University Faculty. Washington, D.C.: American Association of University Professors, 1976.

Garbarino, Joseph W. and Aussieker, Bill. Faculty Bargaining: Change and Conflict. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.

Garbarino, Joseph W. and Lawler, John. "Faculty Union Activity in Higher Education, 1977." Industrial Relations 17 (1978): 117-118.

_____. "Faculty Union Activity in Higher Education, 1978." Professional Engineer 49 (1979): 24-25.

Garrison, Roger H. Junior College Faculty Issues and Problems. Washington, D.C. American Association of Junior Colleges, 1965.

Gianopulos, John. "Collective Negotiation Agreements in Michigan and Illinois." Ph.D. dissertation, Loyola University, Chicago, 1970.

Guthrie-Morse, Barbara; Leslie, Larry L.; and Hu, Teh-Wei. "Assessing the Impact of Faculty Unions: The Financial Implications of Collective Bargaining." The Journal of Higher Education 52 (May/June 1981): 237-255.

Hankin, Joseph N. State Legislation and the Status of Collective Bargaining in Community and Junior Colleges. Washington, D.C.: Academic Collective Bargaining Information Service, 1976.

Hankin, Joseph N. "What's Past is Prologue." New Directions for Community Colleges 3 (1975): 13-22.

Hankin, Joseph N. and Angell, George W. Collective Bargaining in Junior Colleges. Papers presented at conference sponsored by the Junior College Council of the Middle Atlantic States on Collective Bargaining in the Community College. ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 070 437, 1972.

Hardt, John R. "Impact of Collective Bargaining on Governance in Community Colleges." Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1977.

Hilway, Tyrus. The American Two-Year College. New York: Wiley and Sons, 1966.

Hines, Edward R. "Unionization, Campus Bureaucracy, and Faculty Satisfaction in Community Colleges." Paper presented at the National Council of State Directors of Community and Junior Colleges, June 1, 1980.

Hines, Edward R., Prymas, Joan and Dolence, Michael. "The Impact of Faculty Unions in Community Colleges: A Description and Preliminary Analysis." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, April 1980.

Howe, Ray A. "In Anticipation of the Coming of Age of Community College Collective Bargaining." In T.M. Mannix, ed. Collective Bargaining in Higher Education: Proceedings, Fourth Annual Conference. New York: National Center for the Study of Collective Bargaining in Higher Education, 1976. ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 136 659, 1976.

Howe, Ray A. "Myths and Mysteries of Collective Bargaining." New Directions for Community Colleges 1 (1973): 73-86.

Illinois Board of Higher Education. A Master Plan for Higher Education in Illinois. Springfield, IL: State of Illinois, 1964.

Illinois State Chamber of Commerce. The Illinois Junior College. Chicago: Illinois State Chamber of Commerce, 1966.

Jaap, William A. and Baker, George A. "Collective Bargaining in the Community College." Community College Frontiers (Fall 1980): 46-50.

Kellett, Robert H. Trends and Patterns of Change in Public Community College Collective Bargaining Contracts. Washington, D.C.: Academic Collective Bargaining Information Service, 1975.

Kelley, Edward P., Jr. and Rodriguez, Robert L. "Observations on Collective Bargaining: Implications for Academic Management." Liberal Education 63 (1977): 102-117.

Kemerer, Frank R. and Baldridge, J. Victor. "Senate and Unions: Unexpected Peaceful Coexistence." The Journal of Higher Education 52 (May/June 1981): 256-264.

Kemerer, Frank R. and Baldridge, J. Victor. Unions on Campus. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1975.

Kerchner, Charles T. "An Exploration into the Impacts of Faculty Unions on Community Colleges and Their Presidents." Ph.D. dissertation, Northwestern University, 1977.

Kerchner, Charles T. "The 'Unionization' of College Presidents -- Their Response to Faculty Unions." Educational Administration Quarterly 13 (1977): 87-104.

Ladd, Everett C. and Lipset, Seymour M. Professors, Unions, and American Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, 1973.

Lahti, Ronald E. "Management and Governance in the Two-Year College." Community College Review 2 (1979): 12-16.

Landrith, Harold F. Introduction to Community College. Danville, IL: The Interstate Printers, 1971.

Lee, Barbara A. "Governance at Unionized Four-Year Colleges: Effect on Decision Making Structures." The Journal of Higher Education 50 (September/October 1979): 565-585.

Leslie, David W. Impact of Collective Bargaining on Conflict Resolution Practices. Washington, D.C.: Academic Collective Bargaining Information Service, 1975.

Lombardi, Joseph J. Changing Administrative Relations Under Collective Bargaining. Los Angeles, CA: Junior College Resource Review, 1979. ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 170 015, 1979.

Lovell, Ned B.; Bazik, Edna F.; Piland, William E.; McCarthy, John R.; Janes, Larry; Decker, Robert H. A Collective Bargaining Contract Analyzer for Community Colleges. Springfield, IL: Illinois Community College Trustees Association, 1982.

Magarrell, Jack. "Decline in Faculty Morale Laid to Governance Role, Not Salary." The Chronicle of Higher Education, November 10, 1982, pp. 1, 28.

Marks, Kenneth E. Collective Bargaining in U.S. Higher Education 1960-1971: A Selective Bibliography. Ames, IA: Iowa State University Library, 1972.

Marsch, William. State Community College Systems: Their Roles and Operation in Seven States. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1976.

Marshall, Joan L. "The Effects of Collective Bargaining on Faculty Salaries in Higher Education." The Journal of Higher Education 50 (May/June 1979): 310-322.

McConnell, T.R. and Mortimer, Kenneth P. The Faculty in University Governance. Berkeley, CA: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, 1971.

Metzler, John H. Collective Bargaining for Community Colleges. Washington, D.C.: Association of Community College Trustees, 1975.

Mortimer, K.P. and McConnell, T.R. Sharing Authority Effectively. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1978.

Moskow, Michael H. "The Scope of Collective Bargaining in Higher Education." Wisconsin Law Review 1 (1971): 33-54.

Orze, Joseph J. Faculty Collective Bargaining and Academic Decision Making. Washington, D.C.: Academic Collective Bargaining Information Service, 1975.

Palinchak, Robert. The Evolution of the Community College. Metuchen, N J: The Scarecrow Press, Inc., 1973.

Poole, Lawrence H. "The Influence of Collective Bargaining upon Written Policies of Governance in Selected Community Junior Colleges." Ph.D. dissertation, The University of Florida, 1975.

Poole, Lawrence H. and Wattenbarger, James L. "Has Collective Bargaining Influenced Administrative Policies?" Community College Review 4 (1977): 8-11.

Richardson, R. C. Jr. "Can Faculty Unions Provide Leadership on Educational Issues?" Community College Review 7 (1979): 17-21.

Riess, Louis C. Faculty Governance in Turmoil -- Who Speaks for the Junior College Professor? Long Beach, CA: Junior College Faculty Association. ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 017 250.

Rugen, Richard. "The Latent Power of Faculty Associations and Administrative Decision Making at Community Colleges." Ph.D. dissertation, State University of New York at Albany, 1977.

Sabol, John A. "A Case Study on the Governance Function Relative to Faculty Participation at the Community College of Allegheny County from its Beginning Through Two Collective Bargaining Negotiations." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 1976.

Schultz, Daniel F. "Why Faculties Bargain." New Directions for Community Colleges 3 (1975): 23-28.

Shulman, Carol H. Collective Bargaining on Campus. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1972.

Sloan, Arthur A. and Whitney, Fred. Labor Relations. Englewood Cliffs, N J: Prentice Hall, 1967.

Smith, Gerald W. Illinois Junior-Community College Development 1946-1980. Springfield, IL: Illinois Community College Board, 1980.

_____. Philosophy, Purposes, and Functions as Seen by the Illinois Junior College Board. Springfield, IL: Illinois Junior College Board, 1968.

Staller, Jerome M. "Collective Bargaining: Its Effect on Faculty at Two-Year Public Colleges." Paper presented at the Third Annual Conference on Collective Bargaining in Higher Education. New York: ERIC Document Reproduction Services, ED 125 694, 1975.

Taylor, Rodney J. Collective Bargaining and the Community College. ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 134 079, March 1977.

The Illinois Trustee. Springfield, IL: Illinois Trustee Association, 1981.

The National Center for the Study of Collective Bargaining in Higher Education. Directory of Bargaining Agents and Contract in Higher Education. New York: Baruch College of City University of New York, January 1980.

Tice, Terrence N. Faculty Bargaining in the Seventies. Ann Arbor: Institute for Continuing Legal Education, 1973.

Walker, Donald E.; Feldman, David; and Stone, Gregg. "Collegiality and Collective Bargaining: An Alternative Perspective." Educational Record 57 (1976): 119-124.

Weisberger, June. Faculty Grievance Arbitration in Higher Education: Living with Collective Bargaining. Ithaca, N Y: Institute of Public Employment, 1976.

Wellman, Fred. "Review and Preview of the Illinois Public Community College System." Community College Bulletin (June 1980): 51-94.

Weston, Hanna; Nadler, Charles; and Klinefelter, Sarah. "The Dynamics of Collective Bargaining: Challenge of the Future." New Directions for Community Colleges (Winter 1978): 87-96.

Wildmon, Thomas R. "The Legislation Necessary to Effectively Govern Collective Bargaining in Public Higher Education," Wisconsin Law Review 11 (1971): 275-295.

Wollett, Donald H. "The Status and Trends of Negotiations for Faculty in Higher Education," Wisconsin Law Review 1 (1971): 2-32.

Worley, A. Douglas. "A Study of Faculty Collective Bargaining Activity in Florida Community Colleges." Ph.D. dissertation, Nova University, 1975.

Zigarell, James. "The Community College in Search of an Identity." The Journal of Higher Education 41 (1970).

TABLE 1

EXTENT OF FACULTY IMPACT IN INSTITUTIONAL DECISION MAKING[a]

(N=621)

Questionnaire Item	Great and Moderate Impact				Little and No Impact			
	Actual %	Rank #	Preferred %	Rank #	Actual %	Rank #	Preferred %	Rank #
Curriculum - Evaluation and Revision.	76.0	1	98.6	1	24.0	20	1.4	20
Grading System	74.7	2	97.1	4	25.3	19	2.9	17
Teaching Assignment	68.4	3	97.9	3	31.6	18	2.1	18
Curriculum - New Educational Programs	67.5	4	98.3	2	32.5	17	1.6	19
Degree Requirements	55.8	5	93.3	11	44.2	16	6.0	11
Types of Degrees Awarded.	47.7	6	88.7	17	52.3	15	11.3	4
Appointments of New Faculty	46.7	7	95.6	5	53.2	14	4.3	16
Program Admission Requirements.	44.4	8	93.1	12	55.5	13	6.9	9
Teaching Load.	40.8	9	94.8	7	59.1	12	5.2	14
Faculty Salary Schedule.	40.6	10	94.4	8	59.4	11	5.6	12
Raises in Salary for Faculty.	37.0	11	95.1	6	63.0	10	4.9	15
Faculty Tenure.	36.3	12	90.0	16	63.7	9	10.1	5
Short-Range Budgetary Planning.	34.5	13	90.3	15	64.7	8	9.7	6
Selecting Department/Division Chairperson	33.1	14	94.4	8	66.9	7	5.6	12
Degree of Authority	25.8	15	93.4	10	74.3	6	6.6	10
Nonrenewals of Non-tenured Faculty	24.9	16	87.4	18	75.1	5	12.5	3
Dismissal of Faculty for Cause.	23.2	17	84.4	19	76.8	4	14.2	2
Selecting the Chief Executive Officer	17.6	18	92.4	13	82.3	3	7.6	8
Selecting the Chief Academic Officer.	17.0	19	92.1	14	83.0	2	7.8	7
Individual Faculty Salaries Within Department . .	14.8	20	73.7	20	85.1	1	26.4	1

[a]For each of 20 areas of institutional decision making, faculty were asked to give their view about the extent of actual as well as preferred faculty impact in the decision making area on that campus. A four-point scale was used consisting of great, moderate, little, or no faculty impact.

TABLE 2

AREAS OF INCREASED IMPACT AS A RESULT OF COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

(N=368)

Area	1st Choice	%	2nd Choice	%	3rd Choice	%
Appointments of New Faculty	4	1.4	5	1.8	3	1.3
Nonrenewals of Non-Tenured Faculty	5	1.7	2	0.7	1	0.4
Raises in Faculty Salary	170[a]	57.8	25	8.9	18	7.7
Recommending Faculty Tenure	15	5.1	23	8.2	15	6.4
Dismissal of Faculty for Cause	9	3.1	20	7.1	11	4.7
Curriculum-Evaluation & Revision	4	1.4	10	3.6	5	2.1
Curriculum-Estab. New Programs	1	0.3	4	1.4	2	0.9
Degree Requirements	1	0.3	1	0.4	2	0.9
Grading System	0	0.0	2	0.7	3	1.3
Types of Degrees Awarded	0	0.0	1	0.4	0	0.0
Student Admission Requirements	1	0.3	1	0.4	1	0.4
Selecting Chief Executive Officer	0	0.0	4	1.4	2	0.9
Selecting Chief Academic Officer	0	0.0	1	0.4	2	0.9
Selecting Dept./Div. Chairperson	2	0.7	3	1.1	10	4.3
Faculty Salary Schedule	54	18.4	103[a]	36.8	17	4.3
Individual Faculty Salary	1	0.3	2	0.7	5	2.1
Short-Range Budgetary Planning	2	0.7	4	1.4	4	1.7
Teaching Load	15	5.1	47	16.8	88[a]	37.6
Teaching Assignment	6	2.0	7	2.5	26	11.1
Faculty Authority in Campus Governance	1	0.3	2	0.7	10	4.3
Fringe Benefits	2	0.7	7	2.5	3	1.3
Grievance and Arbitration	0	0.0	1	0.4	3	1.3
Policy and Procedures	0	0.0	1	0.4	0	0.0
Reduction of Adversary Rel.	0	0.0	1	0.4	0	0.0
Conditions of Employment	0	0.0	2	0.7	2	0.9
Class Size	1	0.3	1	0.4	1	0.4
Total	$\bar{X}$ = 294	100.0	$\bar{X}$ = 280	100.0	$\bar{X}$ = 234	100.0

[a]Highest Response Rate

TABLE 3

AREAS OF DECREASED IMPACT AS A RESULT OF COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

(N=368)

Area	1st Choice	%	2nd Choice	%	3rd Choice	%
Appointments of New Faculty	5	2.8	4	2.6	7	5.6
Nonrenewals of Non-tenured Faculty	5	2.8	5	3.3	3	2.4
Raises in Faculty Salary	11	6.1	2	1.3	4	3.2
Recommending Faculty Tenure	3	1.7	5	3.3	5	4.0
Dismissal of Faculty for Cause	11	6.1	6	4.0	1	0.8
Curriculum-Evaluation and Revision	12	6.7	8	5.3	3	2.4
Curriculum-Estab. New Programs	7	3.0	10	6.6	7	5.6
Degree Requirements	2	1.1	1	0.7	4	3.2
Grading System	0	0.0	1	0.7	2	1.6
Types of Degrees Awarded	1	0.6	2	1.3	1	0.8
Student Admission Requirements	2	1.1	5	3.3	2	1.6
Selecting Chief Executive Officer	29[a]	16.1	13	8.6	9	7.3
Selecting Chief Academic Officer	4	2.2	19[a]	12.6	8	6.5
Selecting Dept./Div. Chairperson	11	6.1	6	4.0	19[a]	15.3
Faculty Salary Schedule	10	5.6	8	5.3	1	0.8
Individual Faculty Salary	15	8.3	8	5.3	13	10.5
Short-Range Budgetary Planning	9	5.0	9	6.0	6	4.8
Teaching Load	15	8.3	10	6.6	5	4.0
Teaching Assignment	9	5.0	7	4.6	7	5.6
Faculty Authority in Campus Governance	14	7.8	18	11.9	15	12.1
Lack of Board Concern for Faculty	2	1.1	1	0.7	0	0.0
Promotions	2	1.1	0	0.0	0	0.0
Distrust Between Faculty and Admin.	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Sabbaticals	1	0.6	0	0.0	1	0.8
Class Size	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Grievance	0	0.0	1	0.7	0	0.0
Evaluations	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.8
Benefits	0	0.0	2	1.3	0	0.0
Total	$\bar{X}$ = 180	100.0	$\bar{X}$ = 151	100.0	$\bar{X}$ = 124	100.0

[a]Highest Response Rate

TABLE 4

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN UNIONIZED AND NON-UNIONIZED CAMPUSES IN FACULTY DECISION-MAKING IMPACT

	Decision-Making Area	Unionized (N=305) Mean[a]	S.D.	Non-Unionized (N=260) Mean[a]	S.D.	t Value
1	Appointments of New Faculty	2.50	0.94	2.64	0.99	-1.73
2	Non-Renewals of Non-Tenured Faculty	3.09	0.99	3.15	0.96	-0.81
3	Raises in Faculty Salary	2.50	0.87	2.92	0.95	-5.44 ***
4	Recommending Faculty Tenure	2.74	1.06	3.00	1.01	-3.04 **
5	Dismissal of Faculty for Cause	3.05	0.96	3.26	0.89	-2.66 **
6	Curriculum-Evaluation & Revision	1.76	0.79	1.87	0.87	-1.66
7	Curriculum-Estab. New Programs	1.94	0.83	2.14	0.09	-2.63 **
8	Degree Requirements	2.25	0.89	2.39	0.97	-1.78
9	Grading System	1.75	0.95	1.78	1.00	-0.29
10	Types of Degrees Awarded	2.47	1.00	2.56	1.00	-.97
11	Student Admission Requirements	2.47	1.01	2.66	1.02	-1.83
12	Selecting Chief Executive Officer	3.23	0.87	3.36	0.79	-1.93 *
13	Selecting Chief Academic Officer	3.24	0.82	3.31	0.83	-0.93
14	Selecting Department & Division Chairpersons	2.94	1.04	2.90	1.08	0.45
15	Faculty Salary Schedule	2.49	0.90	2.81	0.98	-3.88 ***
16	Individual Faculty Salaries	3.36	0.92	3.49	0.81	-1.66
17	Short-Range Budgetary Planning	2.62	0.91	2.97	0.94	-4.39 ***
18	Teaching Load	2.61	1.04	2.83	1.02	-2.52 **
19	Teaching Assignments	1.94	0.88	2.16	0.93	-2.90 **
20	Faculty Authority in Campus Governance	2.83	0.85	3.06	0.87	-3.17 **

* $p < .05$
** $p < .01$
*** $p < .001$

[a]Means are based on a scale with "1" indicating great impact, "2" moderate impact, "3" little impact, and "4" no impact.

TABLE 5

SIMILARITIES IN DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF RESPONDENTS AT UNIONIZED AND NON-UNIONIZED CAMPUSES

Variable & Category		Unionized		Non-Unionized	
		Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
AGE	20-29	10	3.8	18	5.9
	30-39	88	33.8	88	28.9
	40-49	104	40.0	104	34.1
	50-59	44	16.9	72	23.6
	60+	14	5.4	23	7.5
		260	100.0	305	100.0
SEX	Male	175	67.3	213	70.1
	Female	85	32.7	91	29.9
		260	100.0	304	100.0
TENURE	Tenured	241	92.7	274	90.7
	Non-Tenured	19	7.3	28	9.3
		260	100.0	302	100.0
DEGREE	Diploma	0	0	1	0.3
	Certificate	7	2.7	5	1.7
	Associate	5	1.9	8	2.6
	Bachelor's	20	7.7	26	8.6
	Master's	136	52.5	175	57.9
	Specialist	58	22.4	51	16.9
	Doctoral	33	12.7	36	11.9
		259	99.9	302	99.9
YEARS TEACHING AT COLLEGE					
	0-5	49	18.9	70	23.1
	6-10	67	25.9	68	22.4
	11-15	101	39.0	101	33.3
	16-20	36	13.9	47	15.5
	21-25	2	0.1	10	3.3
	26+	4	0.2	7	2.3
		259	100.0	303	99.0
PRIMARY DISCIPLINE					
	Communications	20	7.7	31	10.2
	Life or Phys. Sci.	47	18.1	41	13.4
	Business or Data Processing	28	10.8	26	8.5
	Mathematics	18	6.9	21	6.9
	Nursing or Allied Health	24	9.2	26	8.5
	Physical Education or Recreation	14	5.4	14	4.6
	Social Science	33	12.7	42	13.8
	Industrial Tech.	25	9.6	33	10.8
	Humanities	22	8.5	27	8.9
	Fine Arts	14	5.4	15	4.9
	Developmental Education	11	4.2	20	6.6
	Other	4	1.5	9	3.0
		260	100.0	305	100.0

TABLE 6

COMPARISONS BETWEEN RESPONDENTS AT UNIONIZED AND NON-UNIONIZED CAMPUSES FOR SIX DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES

Decision-Making Area	A G E		S E X		T E N U R E		YEARS TEACHING		DISCIPLINE	
	Union	Non-Un	Union	Non-Un	Union	Non-Un	Union	Non-Un	Union	Non-Un
1. App. of New Faculty					*				*	***
2. Non-Renewals of Non-Tenured										
3. Raises in Faculty Salary										
4. Recommending Faculty Tenure										
5. Dismissal of Faculty for Cause										
6. Curriculum-Evaluation & Revision								*		***
7. Curriculum-Estab. New Programs									*	
8. Degree Requirements										
9. Grading System						**				
10. Types of Degrees Awarded				*						
11. Student Admission Requirements										***
12. Selecting Chief Executive Officer							*			
13. Selecting Chief Academic Officer										
14. Selecting Department & Div. Chairpersons			*							
15. Faculty Salary Schedule										
16. Ind. Faculty Salaries				*						
17. Short-Range Budgetary Planning			**							*
18. Teaching Load					*	*				
19. Teaching Assignments						**				
20. Faculty Authority in Campus Governance										

* $p < .05$
** $p < .01$
*** $p < .001$

TABLE 7

EXTENT OF FACULTY IMPACT ON SELECTED DECISION-MAKING AREAS IN UNIONIZED COLLEGES ACCORDING TO SEX AND TENURE
(% in Parentheses)

Decision-Making Area		Great Impact	Moderate Impact	Little Impact	No Impact	Total
Selecting Department & Division Chairpersons (14)	Male	22 (13.3)	33 (19.9)	57 (34.3)	54 (32.5)	166
	Female	11 (13.4)	10 12.2)	20 (24.4)	41 (50.0)	82
	Chi Square 7.99, $p < .05$					248
Short-Range Budgetary Planning (17)	Male	22 (12.6)	65 (37.4)	62 (35.6)	25 (14.4)	174
	Female	4 (4.7)	33 (38.8)	22 (25.9)	26 (30.6)	85
	Chi Square 12.92, $p < .01$					259
Appointment of New Faculty	Tenured	32 (13.3)	90 (37.3)	78 (32.4)	41 (17.0)	241
	Non-Tenured	7 (36.8)	7 (36.8)	2 (10.5)	3 (15.8)	19
	Chi Square 9.27, $p < .05$					260
Teaching Load	Tenured	38 (15.8)	84 (35.0)	52 (21.7)	66 (27.5)	240
	Non-Tenured	3 (15.8)	3 (15.8)	10 (52.6)	3 (15.8)	19
	Chi Square 9.89, $p < .05$					259

TABLE 8

EXTENT OF FACULTY IMPACT ON SELECTED DECISION-MAKING AREAS IN UNIONIZED COLLEGES ACCORDING TO YEARS TEACHING
(% in Parentheses)

Decision-Making Area		Great Impact	Moderate Impact	Little Impact	No Impact	Total
Selecting Chief Executive Officer	0-5	2 (4.2)	7 (14.6)	15 (31.3)	24 (50.0)	48
	6-10	3 (4.5)	11 (16.7)	16 (24.2)	36 (54.5)	66
	11-15	0 (0.0)	22 (21.8)	36 (35.6)	43 (42.6)	101
	16-20	0 (0.0)	6 (16.7)	17 (47.2)	13 (36.1)	36
	Chi square	20.04, $p < .05$				251

TABLE 9

EXTENT OF FACULTY IMPACT ON SELECTED DECISION-MAKING AREAS IN UNIONIZED COLLEGES ACCORDING TO PRIMARY DISCIPLINE
(% in Parentheses)

Decision-Making Area	Great Impact	Moderate Impact	Little Impact	No Impact	Total
Appointments of New Faculty					
Communications	5 (25.0)	9 (45.0)	5 (25.0)	1 (5.0)	20
Life or Physical Science	10 (21.3)	15 (31.9)	16 (34.0)	6 (12.8)	47
Business or Data Processing	3 (10.7)	13 (46.4)	10 (35.7)	2 (7.1)	28
Mathematics	2 (11.1)	9 (50.0)	4 (22.2)	3 (16.7)	18
Nursing or Allied Health	2 (8.3)	6 (25.0)	6 (25.0)	10 (41.7)	24
Physical Education or Recreation	0 (0.0)	5 (35.7)	3 (21.4)	6 (42.9)	14
Social Science	4 (12.1)	17 (51.5)	10 (30.3)	2 (6.1)	33
Industrial Technology	5 (20.0)	6 (24.0)	9 (36.0)	5 (20.0)	25
Humanities	4 (18.2)	6 (27.3)	8 (36.4)	4 (18.2)	22
Fine Arts	1 (7.1)	9 (64.3)	2 (14.3)	2 (14.3)	14
Developmental Education	2 (18.2)	2 (18.2)	6 (54.5)	1 (9.1)	11

Chi square 48.43, $p < .05$

TABLE 10

EXTENT OF FACULTY IMPACT ON SELECTED DECISION-MAKING AREAS IN UNIONIZED COLLEGES ACCORDING TO PRIMARY DISCIPLINE
(% in Parentheses)

Decision-Making Area	Great Impact	Moderate Impact	Little Impact	No Impact	Total
Curriculum - Establishing New Programs					
Communications	6 (31.6)	6 (31.6)	5 (26.3)	2 (10.5)	19
Life or Physical Science	15 (31.9)	23 (48.9)	9 (19.1)	0 (0.0)	47
Business or Data Processing	18 (64.3)	7 (25.0)	2 (7.1)	1 (3.6)	28
Mathematics	1 (5.6)	10 (55.6)	4 (22.2)	3 (16.7)	18
Nursing or Allied Health	10 (41.7)	11 (45.8)	2 (8.3)	1 (4.2)	24
Physical Education or Recreation	3 (21.4)	8 (57.1)	3 (21.4)	0 (0.0)	14
Social Science	9 (27.3)	16 (48.5)	7 (21.2)	1 (3.0)	33
Industrial Technology	9 (36.0)	10 (40.0)	5 (20.0)	1 (4.0)	25
Humanities	6 (28.6)	11 (52.4)	4 (19.0)	0 (0.0)	21
Fine Arts	5 (38.5)	3 (23.1)	5 (38.5)	0 (0.0)	13
Developmental Education	4 (40.0)	2 (20.0)	4 (40.0)	0 (0.0)	10
	Chi square 50.14, $p < .05$				

TABLE 11

EXTENT OF FACULTY IMPACT ON SELECTED DECISION-MAKING AREAS IN NON-UNIONIZED COLLEGES ACCORDING TO SEX AND TENURE

(% in Parentheses)

Decision-Making Area	Category	Gr. Impact	Mod. Impact	Little Im.	No Imp.	Total
Types of Degrees Awarded	Male	37 (17.6)	65 (31.0)	73 (34.8)	35 (16.7)	210
	Female	12 (13.6)	29 (33.0)	21 (23.9)	26 (29.5)	88
	Chi square	8.04, p .05				298
Individual Faculty Salaries	Male	4 (2.0)	17 (8.5)	50 (25.0)	129 (64.5)	200
	Female	6 (6.9)	11 (12.6)	11 (12.6)	59 (67.8)	87
	Chi square	9.70, p < .05				287
Grading System	Tenured	147 (54.0)	70 (25.7)	35 (12.9)	20 (7.4)	272
	Non-Tenured	14 (50.0)	3 (10.7)	4 (14.3)	7 (25.0)	28
	Chi square	11.25, p < .01				300
Teaching Load	Tenured	35 (12.8)	67 (24.5)	79 (28.8)	93 (33.9)	274
	Non-Tenured	1 (3.6)	9 (32.1)	14 (50.0)	4 (14.3)	28
	Chi square	9.15, p < .05				302
Teaching Assign-ments	Tenured	74 (27.1)	114 (41.8)	53 (19.4)	32 (11.7)	273
	Non-Tenured	2 (7.1)	15 (53.6)	11 (39.3)	0 (0.0)	28
	Chi square	12.83, p < .01				301

TABLE 12

EXTENT OF FACULTY IMPACT ON SELECTED DECISION-MAKING AREAS IN NON-UNIONIZED COLLEGES ACCORDING TO YEARS TEACHING
(% in Parentheses)

Decision-Making Area	Category	Great Impact	Moderate Impact	Little Impact	No Impact	Total
Curriculum-Evaluation and Revision	0-5	34 (48.6)	27 (38.6)	7 (10.0)	2 (2.9)	70
	6-10	37 (54.4)	15 (22.[illegible])	14 (20.6)	2 (2.9)	68
	11-15	30 (29.7)	39 (38.6)	26 (25.7)	6 (5.9)	101
	16-20	15 (31.9)	19 (40.4)	13 (27.7)	0 (0.0)	47
	21-25	4 (40.0)	4 (40.0)	1 (10.0)	1 (10.0)	10
	Chi square 28.18, $p < .05$					

TABLE 13

EXTENT OF FACULTY IMPACT ON SELECTED DECISION-MAKING AREAS IN NON-UNIONIZED COLLEGES ACCORDING TO PRIMARY DISCIPLINE (% in Parentheses)

Decision-Making Area & Category	Great Impact	Moderate Impact	Little Impact	No Impact	Total
Appointments of New Faculty					
Communications	6 (19.4)	13 (41.9)	5 (16.1)	7 (22.6)	31
Life or Physical Science	4 (9.8)	19 (46.3)	13 (31.7)	5 (12.2)	41
Business or Data Processing	7 (26.9)	9 (34.6)	5 (19.2)	5 (19.2)	26
Mathematics	2 (9.5)	9 (42.9)	9 (42.9)	1 (4.8)	21
Nursing or Allied Health	11 (42.3)	4 (15.4)	10 (38.5)	1 (3.8)	26
Physical Education or Recreation	0 (0.0)	4 (28.6)	5 (35.7)	5 (35.7)	14
Social Science	3 (7.1)	13 (31.0)	10 (23.8)	16 (38.1)	42
Industrial Technology	4 (12.1)	6 (18.2)	12 (36.4)	1 (33.3)	33
Humanities	3 (11.5)	5 (19.2)	12 (46.2)	6 (23.1)	26
Fine Arts	2 (13.3)	6 (40.0)	3 (20.0)	4 (26.7)	15
Developmental Education	1 (5.0)	6 (30.0)	5 (25.0)	8 (40.0)	20

Chi square 67.61, $p < .001$

TABLE 14

EXTENT OF FACULTY IMPACT ON SELECTED DECISION-MAKING AREAS IN NON-UNIONIZED COLLEGES ACCORDING TO PRIMARY DISCIPLINE (% in Parentheses)

Decision-Making Area & Category	Great Impact	Moderate Impact	Little Impact	No Impact	Total
Curriculum-Evaluation & Revision Communications	10 (32.3)	16 (51.6)	5 (16.1)	0 (0.0)	31
Life or Physical Science	17 (41.5)	15 (36.6)	7 (17.1)	2 (4.9)	41
Business or Data Processing	15 (57.7)	6 (23.1)	5 (19.2)	0 (0.0)	26
Mathematics	6 (28.6)	11 (52.4)	4 (19.0)	0 (0.0)	21
Nursing or Allied Health	22 (84.6)	3 (11.5)	1 (3.8)	0 (0.0)	26
Physical Education or Recreation	5 (35.7)	2 (14.3)	7 (50.0)	0 (0.0)	14
Social Science	11 (26.2)	15 (35.7)	12 (28.6)	4 (9.5)	42
Industrial Technology	17 (51.5)	10 (30.3)	4 (12.1)	2 (6.1)	33
Humanities	8 (29.6)	10 (37.0)	7 (25.9)	2 (7.4)	27
Fine Arts	4 (26.7)	7 (46.7)	2 (13.3)	2 (13.3)	15
Developmental Education	6 (30.0)	6 (30.0)	8 (40.0)	0 (0.0)	20

Chi square 64.30, $p < .001$

TABLE 15

EXTENT OF FACULTY IMPACT ON SELECTED DECISION-MAKING AREAS IN NON-UNIONIZED COLLEGES ACCORDING TO PRIMARY DISCIPLINE (% in Parentheses)

Decision-Making Area & Category	Great Impact	Moderate Impact	Little Impact	No Impact	Total
Student Admission Requirements					
Communications	7 (22.6)	13 (41.9)	8 (25.8)	3 (9.7)	31
Life or Physical Science	4 (10.0)	16 (40.0)	12 (30.0)	8 (20.0)	40
Business or Data Processing	4 (16.0)	4 (16.0)	13 (52.0)	4 (16.0)	25
Mathematics	3 (14.3)	4 (19.0)	9 (42.9)	5 (23.8)	21
Nursing or Allied Health	14 (53.8)	9 (34.6)	3 (11.5)	0 (0.0)	26
Physical Education or Recreation	1 (7.1)	2 (14.3)	7 (50.0)	4 (28.6)	14
Social Science	5 (12.2)	6 (14.6)	18 (43.9)	12 (29.3)	41
Industrial Technology	7 (21.2)	6 (18.2)	8 (24.2)	12 (36.4)	33
Humanities	2 (7.7)	5 (19.2)	11 (42.3)	8 (30.8)	26
Fine Arts	3 (21.4)	4 (28.6)	3 (21.4)	4 (28.6)	14
Developmental Education	1 (5.3)	5 (26.3)	6 (31.6)	7 (36.8)	19

Chi square 67.96, $p < .001$

TABLE 16

EXTENT OF FACULTY IMPACT ON SELECTED DECISION-MAKING AREAS IN NON-UNIONIZED COLLEGES ACCORDING TO PRIMARY DISCIPLINE (% in Parentheses)

Decision-Making Area & Category	Great Impact	Moderate Impact	Little Impact	No Impact	Total
Short-Range Budgetary Planning					
Communications	1 (3.3)	7 (23.3)	11 (36.7)	11 (36.7)	30
Life or Physical Science	2 (4.9)	11 (26.8)	15 (36.6)	13 (31.7)	41
Business or Data Processing	2 (8.0)	7 (28.0)	10 (40.0)	6 (24.0)	25
Mathematics	0 (0.0)	4 (19.0)	9 (42.9)	8 (38.1)	21
Nursing or Allied Health	6 (24.0)	3 (12.0)	8 (32.0)	8 (32.0)	25
Physical Education or Recreation	1 (7.1)	2 (14.3)	8 (57.1)	3 (21.4)	14
Social Science	2 (4.8)	3 (7.1)	19 (45.2)	18 (42.9)	42
Industrial Technology	9 (27.3)	6 (18.2)	8 (24.2)	10 (30.3)	33
Humanities	0 (0.0)	4 (14.8)	12 (44.4)	11 (40.7)	27
Fine Arts	3 (20.0)	5 (33.3)	4 (26.7)	3 (20.0)	15
Developmental Education	0 (0.0)	3 (15.8)	6 (31.6)	10 (52.6)	19
	Chi square 53.64, $p < .01$				